

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 21 2008

Docket No. F-8417

Ser. No. 10/511,236

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 remain pending in this application. Claims 1-16 are rejected.

Provided below is a response to the *Response to Arguments* section of the Office Action, as found on pages 2-3 of the Office Action. Subsequently, Applicants have selected particular claims and have provided very specific reasons for the patentability of those claims to demonstrate to the USPTO that the inventions of the cited art and the claimed invention are different.

The Office Action states on page 2 that Hirose et al. teaches a conversation database including a plurality of reply sentences. However, Hirose et al. does not teach the retrieval of a reply sentence, as recited in claim 1. Storing a dialogue stream is not the same as retrieving a reply sentence.

The Office Action states on page 2 that Hirose et al. teaches evaluations made based on matching and that this is the same as the determination of a type of input. Hirose et al. fails to determine the type of input since, for example, Hirose et al. does a word search and this is not the same as determining a type of input. Also, performing a matching is not the same as determining a type of input. For example, in paragraph [219] of Hirose et al., which is cited by the Office Action, there is a discussion of matching of participants and does not mention determining a type of input.

The Office Action states on page 2 that Hirose et al. teaches a topic identification information since it teaches a subject input box. However, having

Docket No. F-8417

Scr. No. 10/511,236

a subject input box and also having a retrieval is not the same as having a topic identification information search unit. The Office Action has not shown any topic identification search unit. Even if the Examiner's position is that the subject input box may be used to input a subject line in an email, this does not mean that a topic identification information search unit is present, as recited in claim 3.

The Office Action states on the paragraph bridging pages 2-3 that Hirose et al. discloses generating a keyword list with information on the frequency of appearance of the words and that therefore ranking according to frequency of search is disclosed in Hirose et al. However, information regarding frequency of appearance of key words in dialogue streams is not the same as ranking based on frequency of search at the topic search unit.

Additionally, the prior Amendment identified many limitations that are absent from the cited art and the Office Action only selectively addressed some of Applicants' arguments regarding these the limitations. For example, the Examiner did not address Applicants' arguments made in the prior Amendment regarding claims 6 or 14.

Also, the limitations in the present claims are interrelated and citing separate portions of the prior art without explaining how they are interrelated is insufficient to reject the claims of the present application. Applicants respectfully point out that the courts have made clear that "[a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed

Docket No. F-8417

Ser. No. 10/511,236

invention, arranged as in the claim". See *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company et al.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The Office Action cites to portions of the Hirose et al. disclosure without explanation as to how the citations meet the present claims. For example, claim 1 recites first morpheme information in two different elements and the Office Action's citations to Hirose et al. regarding those two elements are not the same and no explanation is made to show that the alleged disclosure of the first morpheme information in the various portions of Hirose et al. is the same information. A similar situation occurs with second morpheme information. Accordingly, the USPTO has not met its burden in showing anticipation of the claims. It is incumbent on the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in the first instance to set forth clearly why it regards a claim to be anticipated. See *In re Mullin*, 179 USPQ 97, 100 (CCPA 1973).

Below is a claim chart demonstrating that the USPTO has not met its burden to show anticipation of claim 1, 3, and 5, and obviousness of claim 6.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 21 2008

Docket No. F-8417

Ser. No. 10/511,236

A detailed analysis of claim 1 is provided below.

Limitation in Claim 1	Office Action's citations.
1) Conversation control system which retrieves, based on input information received from a user, a reply sentence to the input information.	Office Action does not provide a citation for this. Moreover, Hirose et al. discloses no retrieval of a reply sentence based on input information from a user. Hirose et al. is directed to retrieving words, not sentences.
2) a morpheme extracting unit configured to extract, based on a character string corresponding to the input information, at least one morpheme constituting a minimum unit of the character string, as first morpheme information	Office Action cites to paragraph [0185] of Hirose et al. However, this paragraph pertains to dialogue streams, not to input information from a user.
3) a conversation database configured to store pieces of second morpheme information each including a morpheme including a character, a string of characters or a combination thereof, and a plurality of reply sentences, which are associated with the pieces of second morpheme information	Office Action cites to paragraphs [0055-0061], [0073], and [0083-0084] of Hirose et al. The claimed recitations include pieces of second morpheme information and reply sentences associated with the pieces of second morpheme information. The Office Action does not identify which specific disclosure in paragraphs [0055-0061], [0073], and [0083-0084] is the second morpheme information and which is the reply sentences and where they are specifically disclosed as being associated.

Docket No. F-8417

Ser. No. 10/511,236

4) a topic search unit configured to compare, based on the first morpheme information extracted at the morpheme extracting unit, the first morpheme information with pieces of second morpheme information, and to search a piece of second morpheme information corresponding to the first morpheme information from among the pieces of second morpheme information

Office Action cites to paragraphs [0085], [0116], [0119-0132], and [0188] of Hirose et al. However, the Office Action does not provide an explanation as to what information is the first morpheme information and which is the second morpheme information and where the two are disclosed as compared in Hirose et al. Furthermore, the Office Action does not explain how the first morpheme information is the same as in limitation 2) above. Also, paragraph [0085] deals with dialogue streams, not to first morpheme information extracted at a morpheme extracting unit. The Office Action has not explained the relevance of paragraphs [0116] and [0119-0132] as they pertain to paragraph [0085]. The Office Action fails to explain what the relationship is between paragraph [0188] and paragraphs [0085], [0116], and [0119-0132]. Additionally, the Office Action has not identified which disclosure is specifically directed to a piece of second morpheme information being searched and disclosure of the correspondence to the first morpheme information.

Docket No. F-8417

Scr. No. 10/511,236

5) a reply retrieval unit configured to retrieve, based on the piece of second morpheme information searched at the topic search unit, a reply sentence associated with the searched piece of second morpheme information

The Office Action cites to paragraphs [0057], [0072-0080], and [0092] of Hirose et al. The Office Action fails to identify in paragraphs [0057], [0072-0080], and [0092] which piece of second information was searched at the topic search unit and which reply sentence is associated with such piece of second morpheme information and where it is disclosed that this reply sentence is retrieved. Additionally, the Office Action does not explain how this piece of second morpheme information is the same as the piece of second morpheme information as in limitation 4) above. Also, the Office Action does not identify the relationship between paragraph [0057] and paragraphs [0072-0080] and [0092] of Hirose et al. and also the relationship between paragraphs [0072-0080] and [0092] of Hirose et al.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 21 2008

Docket No. F-8417

Ser. No. 10/511,236

A detailed analysis of claim 3 is provided below.

Limitation in Claim 3	Office Action's citations.
<p>1) The conversation control system as set forth in claim 1, further comprising a topic identification information search unit configured to compare, based on the first morpheme information extracted at the morpheme extracting unit, the first morpheme information with pieces of topic identification information for identifying a topic, and to search a piece of topic identification information corresponding to the morpheme constituting the first morpheme information from among the pieces of topic identification information, wherein</p>	<p>The Office Action cites to paragraph [0085], [0116], [0119-0132], and [0188] of Hirose et al. However, the Office Action does not provide an explanation as to what information is deemed the first morpheme information and where it is disclosed as being compared with the topic identification information. Furthermore, the Office Action does not explain how the first morpheme information is the same as in limitations 2) and 4) in claim 1. Also, paragraph [0085] deals with dialogue streams, not with first morpheme information extracted at a morpheme extracting unit. The Office Action has not identified the relevance of paragraphs [0116] and [0119-0132] and how they relate to paragraph [0085]. The Office Action fails to explain what the relationship is between paragraph [0188] and paragraphs [0085], [0116], and [0119-0132]. Additionally, the Office Action has not identified where it is disclosed that a piece of topic identification information is searched and that it corresponds to the first morpheme information. Also, the Office Action states that paragraph [0188] discloses retrieval but does not explain what is being retrieved and how this meets any of the limitations of claim 3.</p>

Docket No. F-8417

Ser. No. 10/511,236

2) the pieces of topic identification information are each associated with the pieces of second morpheme information;

The Office Action cites to paragraph [0185] of Hirose et al. However, this limitation is directed to pieces of second morpheme information and the Office Action states, regarding limitation 2) of claim 1, that paragraph [0185] is directed to first morpheme information. Such inconsistent positions cannot be utilized to show anticipation. Also, the Office Action fails to explain what information in paragraph [0185] of Hirose et al. is the topic identification information and which is the second morpheme information and any disclosure of their association. Moreover, Hirose et al. does not provide an explanation on how the alleged topic identification information in paragraph [0185] is the same as the topic identification information addressed in element 1) above.



Docket No. F-8417

Ser. No. 10/511,236

3) the pieces of second morpheme information are each associated with the reply sentences; and

The Office Action cites to paragraph [0185] of Hirose et al. This is the third time that this paragraph is cited by the Office Action. The first citation was for the first morpheme information in limitation 2) of claim 1. Then, it was cited for the second morpheme information in limitation 2) of the present claim. Now, it is being cited for the association between reply sentences and second morpheme information. Again, the burden of anticipation cannot be met by taking inconsistent positions regarding the disclosure of a reference to arrive at the claimed invention. Also, the Office Action fails to explain what information in paragraph [0185] of Hirose et al. is the second morpheme information and which disclosure includes the reply sentences and where it is disclosed that they are associated with one another. Moreover, Hirose et al. does not provide an explanation on how the alleged reply sentences in paragraph [0185] are the same as the reply sentences recited in claim 1. Also, the Office Action states on page 2 that the reply sentences are disclosed on paragraphs 83-84 of Hirose et al. but does not explain how this is related to paragraph [0185] which is also being cited for the disclosure of the reply sentences.

Docket No. F-8417

Ser. No. 10/511,236

4) the topic search unit is configured to compare, based on the piece of topic identification information searched at the topic identification information search unit, pieces of second morpheme information associated with the piece of topic identification information with the first morpheme information extracted at the morpheme extracting unit, and to search a piece of second morpheme information corresponding to the first morpheme information from among the pieces of second morpheme information.

The Office Action cites to paragraphs [0177], [0192], [0219], and [0119] of Hirose et al. However, the Office Action fails to disclose which one is the topic search unit, which is the topic identification information, which is the topic identification information search unit, which are the pieces of second morpheme information, which is the first morpheme information, or which is the morpheme extracting unit in the cited paragraphs. The USPTO has the burden of explaining how the reference meets all the elements of the claims and no such explanation has been provided. Moreover, the Office Action has not identified the inter-relationship between paragraphs [0177], [0192], [0219], and [0119] of Hirose et al. Also, the Office Action fails to identify the relationship between the topic search unit, the topic identification information, the topic identification information search unit, the pieces of second morpheme information, the first morpheme information, and the morpheme extracting unit allegedly disclosed in paragraphs [0177], [0192], [0219], and [0119] of Hirose et al. with the recitations of these elements in the other portions of claim 3 and/or claim 1.

Docket No. F-8417

Scr. No. 10/511,236

A detailed analysis of claim 5 is provided below.

Limitation in Claim 5	Office Action's citations.
<p>1) The conversation control system as set forth in claim 1, further comprising a ranking unit configured to perform ranking according to the frequency of search of a piece of second morpheme information at the topic search unit</p>	<p>The Office Action cites to paragraphs [0258], [0177], [0189], and [0198] of Hirose et al. The Office Action fails to identify which is the topic search unit in paragraphs [0258], [0177], [0189], and [0198] of Hirose et al. Although the Office Action states that paragraphs [0177], [0189], and [0198] teach generating a keyword list, paragraph [0189] does not pertain to generating a key word list. Furthermore, the Office Action has not explained how the alleged second morpheme information disclosed in paragraphs [0258], [0177], [0189], and [0198] of Hirose et al. is related to the second morpheme information of limitations 3), 4), and 5) of claim 1. Although the Office Action states that paragraph [258] of Hirose et al. teaches the ranking of a keyword list, paragraph [258] does not pertain to a keyword list.</p>

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 21 2008

Docket No. F-8417

Ser. No. 10/511,236

2) the pieces of second morpheme information are each associated with a plurality of reply sentences;

The Office Action cites to paragraph [0185] of Hirose et al. This is the third time that this paragraph is cited by the Office Action. The first citation was for the first morpheme information in limitation 2) of claim 1. Then, it was cited for the second morpheme information in limitation 2) of claim 3. Now, it is being cited for the association between reply sentences and second morpheme information. Again, the burden of anticipation cannot be met by taking inconsistent positions regarding the disclosure of a reference to arrive at the claimed invention. Also, the Office Action fails to explain what information in paragraph [0185] of Hirose et al. is the second morpheme information and which disclosure includes the reply sentences and where it is disclosed that they are associated with one another. Moreover, the Office Action does not provide an explanation on how the alleged reply sentences in paragraph [0185] are the same as the reply sentences recited in claim 1. Also, the Office Action states on page 2 that the reply sentences are disclosed on paragraphs [83-84] of Hirose et al. but does not explain how this is related to paragraph [0185] which is also being cited for the disclosure of the reply sentences.

Docket No. F-8417

Ser. No. 10/511,236

<p>3) the reply sentences are each associated with priority levels</p>	<p>The Office Action cites to paragraph [258] of Hirose et al. However, there is no explanation in the Office Action of what disclosure in paragraph [258] of Hirose et al. is that of the reply sentences and that of the priority levels and also there is no explanation as to where it is disclosed that they are associated. Moreover, the Office Action does not provide information as to whether the alleged reply sentences on paragraph [258] of Hirose et al. are the same as those cited in paragraph [185] and [83-84] of Hirose et al. which are also cited by the Office Action regarding reply sentences. Also, it is Applicants' position that paragraph [258] does not pertain to reply sentences.</p>
--	--

Docket No. F-8417

Ser. No. 10/511,236

4) and the reply retrieval unit is configured to compare, based on the piece of second morpheme information searched at the topic search unit, the priority levels associated with the reply sentences with the rank determined at the ranking unit, to identify a priority level corresponding to the rank from among the priority levels, and to retrieve a reply sentence associated with an identified priority level.

The Office Action cites to paragraphs [0258] and [0185] of Hirose et al. However, the Office Action does not provide an explanation as to what disclosure in paragraphs [0258] and [0185] is that of a reply retrieval unit, the piece of second morpheme information, the reply sentences, the rank, the ranking unit, or the priority level, nor is there any disclosure of where the priority level corresponding to the rank is identified nor where a reply sentence is retrieved and where the reply sentence is associated with an identified priority level. Additionally, the Office Action does not provide an explanation as to what is the relationship between the alleged reply retrieval unit, the piece of second morpheme information, the topic search unit, the priority levels, the reply sentences, and the ranking unit allegedly disclosed on paragraphs [0258] and [0185] and the citation to these same elements in claim 1 above and/or in other portions of claim 5.

017/018  
**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**MAY 21 2008**

Docket No. F-8417

Scr. No. 10/511,236

A detailed analysis of claim 6 is provided below.

Limitation in Claim 6	Office Action's citations.
The conversation control system as set forth in claim 5, wherein the reply retrieval unit is configured to not retrieve the reply sentence when the rank determined at the ranking unit is the lowest.	The Office Action admits that this disclosure is not found in Hirose et al. and relies on de Hita et al. for this teaching. However, in Hirose et al. the objective is to do a word search and no reason has been provided for one of ordinary skill to omit any results.

Accordingly, the USPTO has not met its burden to show anticipation or obviousness of claims 1, 3, 5, and 6. Claim 9 is patentable for similar reasons as claim 1. Claim 11 is patentable for similar reasons as claim 3. Claim 13 is patentable for similar reasons as claim 5. Claim 14 is patentable for similar reasons as claim 6. Claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 15, and 16 are patentable at least for the reason that they depend from a patentable base claim. Moreover, the analysis made above could be extended to other claims but for the interests of brevity was limited to claims 1, 3, 5, and 6.

No fee is believed due. If there is any fee due the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

018/018

MAY 21 2008

Docket No. F-8417

Ser. No. 10/511,236

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg  
C. Bruce Hamburg  
Reg. No. 22,389  
Attorney for Applicants

By and,

By Ricardo Unikel  
Ricardo Unikel  
Reg. No. 52,309  
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340